



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,246	04/06/2001	William L. Grouell	843161-85	2732

7590 06/18/2002
Brain M Berliner
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

EXAMINER

CHERVINSKY, BORIS LEO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2835

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/828,246

Applicant(s)

GROUELL, WILLIAM L.

Examiner

Boris L. Chervinsky

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner acknowledges the submission of the amendment filed on 05/31/02.

The amendment filed 05/31/02 proposes amendments to claims that do not comply with 37 CFR 1.173(b), which sets forth the manner of making amendments in reissue applications. A supplemental paper correctly amending the reissue application is required.

Reissue Applications

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because none of the errors, which are relied upon to support the reissue application, are errors upon which a reissue can be based. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414. Failure to present independent claims having a certain scope in the original patent is not acceptable reason for reissue. Applicant must identify a single word, phrase or expression in the specification or in an original claim which renders the original patent wholly or partly inoperative or invalid

Claims 1-22 rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

The nature of the defect(s) in the declaration is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9-13, 15 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skutt et al. in view of Wilens.

Skutt et al. discloses a shield 58 comprising rectangular plate with a plurality of louvers 100 having a longitudinal edge with ends spaced inward from the sides of the plate, two side edges and a fourth edge integral with the plate. Skutt et al. disclose the claimed invention except having the plate to be used with a hard disk drive. Wilens discloses a shield attached to a heat generating device 25 including louvers 24, a depression to contact the heat generating device, as claimed in claims 2, 5, 15, 20. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the shield as disclosed by Skutt et al. for cooling a heat generating device including a hard disk drive as disclosed by Wilens since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647. (1987).

3. Claims 3, 6, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skutt et al. in view of Wilens.

Details drawn to the plate having outward-upward slanted edges and another set of louvers oriented in opposite direction are well known in the art (references listed in US PTO 892 form which are not applied at this time show these features) and are not considered to be demonstrated as critical and therefore obvious, it also must be noted

that louvered plates are widely used in numerous domestic situations such as vent grills of different shapes and sizes.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/31/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation that the shield is for use with a hard disk drive or computer storage system comprising a hard drive has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). It also must be noted that the hard disk drive has not been positively set forth as part of the claimed structure in the claims.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. In *re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. In *re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures. In *re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA) 1969. In this case, Skutt teaches the structure of the plate having a plurality of louvers being attached to an electrical device and the

structure reads on the claims, Wilens teaches a heat dissipating device having louvers-like elements attached to a heat generating component and it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Wilens and Skutt for someone versed in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris L. Chervinsky whose telephone number is 703-308-5429. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren E. Schuberg can be reached on 703-308-4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9318 for regular communications and 703-872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-5115.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Boris L. Chervinsky".

Boris L. Chervinsky, Patent Examiner
June 14, 2002